

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,749 12/04/2002		Surjit A. Chadha	100718.409/MIC-54CN/DV1 1559	
23483 7	590 12/29/2004		EXAM	NER
WILMER CU 60 STATE STI		HALE AND DORR LLP	SANTIAGO, MARICELI	
BOSTON, MA 02109		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A	سے
~ `	_

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/042,749	CHADHA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Mariceli Santiago	2879			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication approximation of the communication approximation approxima		the correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the provision of the		y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. IS from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			•			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29	September 2004.				
. 2a) <u></u>						
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 10 and 13-21 is/are pending in the a	application				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	• •				
	Claim(s) <u>10,13,14,16,18 and 20</u> is/are allower					
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15,17,19 and 21</u> is/are rejected.					
7)						
8)□						
Applicati	ion Papers	,				
	·					
	The specification is objected to by the Examir		bis de distribuir e			
10)[The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 December 2002</u> is,					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		* *			
441	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre					
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner. Note the attached C	Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		19(a)-(d) or (f).			
	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea		ceived in this National Stage			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		ceived.			
			·			
Attachmen	t(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Therview Sum	nmary (PTO-413)			
2) Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/N	/lail Date			
3) LI Inform Pape	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Infor 6) Other:	rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
I.S. Patent and To PTOL-326 (R		Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20041226			

Art Unit: 2879

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on September 29, 2004, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Cancellation of claims 1-9, 11 and 12 has been entered.

Claims 10 and 13-21 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 17 and 19 recite the limitation "and/or semiconductive", the recitation renders the claim indefinite since the previous claim states that the binder is conductive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (US 5,404,074) in view of Speigel et al. (US 3,763,051).

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claims 15 and 21, Watanabe discloses a method of manufacturing a field emission display panel comprising the steps of providing a faceplate (3) comprising a transparent screen having at least one side, applying a transparent conductor (4) to the side of the screen, and applying a phosphor composition (5) to the transparent conductors, providing a baseplate (10) comprising a base electrode (8), a plurality of conical field emission cathodes (6) having a base and a tip, the bases of the field emission cathodes being disposed on the base electrode, and a grid electrode (7) disposed proximally to the tips of the field emission cathodes, positioning the baseplate proximal the side of said screen so that the baseplate is spaced apart from the faceplate, and providing a vacuum gap between the faceplate and the baseplate. Watanabe is silent in regards to the limitation of simultaneously applying a layer of phosphor and semiconductive binder material to the transparent conductors, the binder material holding the phosphor to the transparent conductors. However, in the same field of endeavor, Speigel discloses a method of manufacturing a display device comprising anode structures coated with a phosphor composition within an evacuated display panel. Furthermore, Speigel discloses the method of simultaneously applying a layer of phosphor and semiconductive binder material, i.e. potassium silicate, to the anode structure, the binder material holding the phosphor to the anode structure. The disclosed phosphor coating technique and composition allows for ease in reproduction of uniform phosphor layers. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate the phosphor composition and coating technique disclosed by Speigel in the method of Watanabe in order to provide a uniform phosphor coating which is easy to reproduce.

Page 3

Art Unit: 2879

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10, 13, 14, 16, 18 and 20 are allowed over the prior art of record.

Claims 17 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claims 10 and 20, the references of the Prior Art of record fails to teach or suggest the combination of the limitations as set forth in claims 10 and 20, and specifically comprising the limitation of simultaneously applying a phosphor material and a binder material on the screen, the binder material holding the phosphor material to the screen, the binder material comprising a conductive material.

Regarding claims 13, 14 and 16-19, claims 13, 14 and 16-19 are allowable for the reasons given in claim 10 because of their dependency status from claim 10.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed September 29, 2004, with respect to the rejection of claim 21 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Watanabe et al. (US 5,404,074) in view of Speigel et al. (US 3,763,051).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariceli Santiago whose telephone number is (571) 272-2464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2879

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Page 5

supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mariceli Santiago Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2879